

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,941	WELCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANDREW D. KOSAR	1654	

All Participants:

(1) ANDREW D. KOSAR.

(2) Julia Grimes.

Date of Interview: 28 June 2010

Status of Application: after response to interview

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:00

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

potential 103 and 112

Claims discussed:

all, in general

Prior art documents discussed:

Hollander

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Andrew D Kosar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed amendments to the claims which would place the application in condition for allowance. Claim 26, being amended to inflammatory bowel disease, and new claim 32, drawn to treating primary biliary cirrhosis, would be allowable, finding sufficient enablement in the specification as filed. All remaining claims would be cancelled and the restriction would be withdrawn only to the extent 26 and 'new' claim 32 would be rejoined. The examiner indicated that Hollander (attached) would have formed the basis of the obviousness rejection, similar to that which was previously set forth, however it was published 1/03. Applicant's representative requested time to consult with the client/foreign associate. In the interview of 7/17/10, the examiner indicated that dependent claims from 26 and 32 would be entered and that 'inflammatory' would replace 'irritable' in claim 26, as it is the exemplified embodiment of the specification and appeared to be a typographical error, as irritable bowel disease is not a 'real' condition, but rather inflammatory bowel disease or irritable bowel syndrome. To the examiner, it was clear from the specification examples that 'inflammatory' was the correct term. Agreement was reached on allowable subject matter in an interview of 7/17/10.